



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,834	07/21/2003	Jean-Marc Karl Edgard Maurice Virgin	HOE-767	9246
20/028	7/5/0	05/21/2009		
Lipsitz & McAllister, LLC 755 MAIN STREET MONROE, CT 06468			EXAMINER THOMAS, LUCY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/626,834

Applicant(s)

VIRGIN ET AL.

Examiner

Lucy Thomas

Art Unit

2836

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lucy Thomas.

(3) _____.

(2) Douglas M. McAllister.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 85, 86 and 88.

Identification of prior art discussed: Thrash and Saito.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It is argued that Thrash reference does not teach detecting parallel arc, and argued against Thrash and Saito combination. It is also argued that Thrash does not teach the detector element as disclosed in Claims 85, 86, and 88. Arguments and/or amendments will be fully considered upon receipt of the next response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Fritz M Fleming/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2836